

Hydroacoustics for the discovery and quantification of Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) spawning aggregations

Egerton, Jack; Johnson, A.F.; Le Vay, Lewis; McCoy, C.M.; Semmens, B.X.; Heppell, S.A.; Turner, John

Coral Reefs

DOI:

[10.1007/s00338-017-1542-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-017-1542-4)

Published: 01/06/2017

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Egerton, J., Johnson, A. F., Le Vay, L., McCoy, C. M., Semmens, B. X., Heppell, S. A., & Turner, J. (2017). Hydroacoustics for the discovery and quantification of Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) spawning aggregations. *Coral Reefs*, 36(2), 589-600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-017-1542-4>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

2 **Hydroacoustics for the discovery and quantification of Nassau**
3 **grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) spawning aggregations**

4 **J. P. Egerton¹ · A. F. Johnson² · L. Le Vay¹ · C. M. McCoy³ ·**
5 **B. X. Semmens² · S. A. Heppell⁴ · J. R. Turner¹**

6 Received: 23 June 2016 / Accepted: 5 January 2017
7 © Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2017

8 **Abstract** Fish spawning aggregations (FSAs) are vital
9 life-history events that need to be monitored to determine
10 the health of aggregating populations; this is especially true
11 of the endangered Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*).
12 Hydroacoustics were used to locate Nassau grouper FSAs
13 at sites on the west end of Little Cayman (LCW), and east
14 ends of Grand Cayman (GCE) and Cayman Brac (CBE).
15 Fish abundance and biomass at each FSA were estimated
16 via echo integration and FSA extent. Acoustic mean fish
17 abundance estimates (\pm SE) on the FSA at LCW
18 (893 ± 459) did not differ significantly from concurrent
19 SCUBA estimates (1150 ± 75). Mean fish densities
20 (number 1000 m^{-3}) were significantly higher at LCW
21 (33.13 ± 5.62) than at the other sites (GCE: 7.01 ± 2.1 ,
22 CBE: 4.61 ± 1.16). We investigate different acoustic post-
23 processing options to obtain target strength (TS), and we
24 examine the different TS to total length (TL) formulas
25 available. The SCUBA surveys also provided measures of
26 TL through the use of laser callipers allowing development

of an in situ TS to TL formula for Nassau grouper at the
LCW FSA. Application of this formula revealed mean fish
TL was significantly higher at LCW ($65.4 \pm 0.7\text{ cm}$) than
GCE ($60.7 \pm 0.4\text{ cm}$), but not CBE ($61.1 \pm 2.5\text{ cm}$). Use
of the empirical TS to TL formula resulted in underesti-
mation of fish length in comparison with diver measure-
ments, highlighting the benefits of secondary length data
and deriving specific TS to TL formulas for each popula-
tion. FSA location examined with reference to seasonal
marine protected areas (Designated Grouper Spawning
Areas) showed FSAs were partially outside these areas at
GCE and very close to the boundary at CBE. As FSAs
often occur at the limits of safe diving operations,
hydroacoustic technology provides an alternative method
to monitor and inform future management of aggregating
fish species.

Keywords Hydroacoustics · Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus*
striatus) · Fish spawning aggregations (FSAs) · Echo
integration

A1 Topical Editor Dr. Andrew Hoey

A2 **Electronic supplementary material** The online version of this
A3 article (doi:[10.1007/s00338-017-1542-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-017-1542-4)) contains supplementary
A4 material, which is available to authorized users.

A5 ✉ J. P. Egerton
A6 j.egerton@bangor.ac.uk

A7 ¹ School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University, Menai Bridge,
A8 Wales, UK

A9 ² Marine Biology Research Division, Scripps Institute of
A10 Oceanography, California, USA

A11 ³ Department of Environment, Cayman Islands Government,
A12 PO Box 10202, Grand Cayman KY1-1002, Cayman Islands

A13 ⁴ Oregon State University, 104 Nash Hall, Corvallis, OR, USA

Introduction

Fish spawning aggregations (FSAs) are broadly defined as
'a group of conspecific fish gathered for the purposes of
spawning with fish densities significantly higher than are
found during the non-reproductive periods' (Domeier and
Colin 1997). This reproductive strategy creates temporary
concentrations of fish (Johannes 1978; Kobara and Heyman
2008) that are highly susceptible to overfishing (Nemeth
2005; Starr et al. 2007; Sadovy de Mitcheson and Erisman
2012). The health of a FSA is a good indicator of the health
of the population as a whole (Gascoigne 2002), and any
depletion of a FSA has serious consequences for the

reproductive output of that population (Sadovy and Domeier 2005; Sadovy de Mitcheson 2016). FSAs therefore are important life-history phenomena that must be considered in any efforts to manage fisheries of aggregating species (Sadovy and Colin 2012; Sadovy de Mitcheson 2016). We use the term FSA for fish that are gathered together for the purpose of spawning. We acknowledge, however, that the aggregations of fish detected may not have been spawning per se at the specific times of the surveys.

One of the best known examples of the demise of a species due to FSA over fishing is that of the Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al. 2008). These large top-level predators are an important species within Caribbean reef ecosystems (Stallings 2008, 2009; Archer et al. 2012). Nassau grouper migrate to specific sites during periods of winter full moons to reproduce in FSAs (Sala et al. 2001; Whaylen et al. 2004; Starr et al. 2007) and were one of the first large-bodied tropical reef-fish species scientifically documented to do so (Smith 1972). It is estimated that 75% of all known Nassau grouper spawning aggregations have either been eradicated or reduced to negligible numbers (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al. 2008). Following over-exploitation, these aggregations often fail to recover (Gibson 2007; Semmens et al. 2007), although recent evidence suggests that effective management can lead to population increases (Kadison et al. 2010; Heppell et al. 2012). FSAs in the Cayman Islands have been reported on the eastern and southwest points of Grand Cayman, the northeast and southwest points of Little Cayman and the southwest point of Cayman Brac (Bush et al. 2006). These sites were protected by legislation in 2003 which prohibits fishing in these areas (Whaylen et al. 2006), and due to winter spawning, it is now forbidden to take a Nassau grouper from Cayman waters during the months of December to April (Cayman Islands Government 2016).

Monitoring spawning aggregations

AQ1 Monitoring an FSA is an effective way to determine the health of an aggregating population, but adequately monitoring an FSA requires a clear understanding of its location, extent, and dynamics. In-water monitoring is fraught with difficulties including high temporal variability in fish numbers and variable distribution across multiple sites, the expense of underwater visual census (UVC) surveys and challenging underwater working conditions (including strong currents, poor visibility and FSA locations below safe diver depth limits) (Sadovy and Domeier 2005). This is especially true in the Cayman Islands where FSAs occur on the extreme tips of the islands at locations where currents are strong and dives must occur at dawn and dusk to

coincide with periods of peak fish activity. Further, observer bias may be present in UVC surveys and fish may avoid divers (Colin 1992; Murphy and Jenkins 2010).

Hydroacoustics may be useful for assessing aggregating reef fishes that are otherwise difficult to count (Johannes et al. 1999). One of the main advantages of hydroacoustics is the ability to collect large volumes of information in a short amount of time (Trenkel et al. 2011; Jones et al. 2012). Further, unlike video or UVC, the acoustic technique is unaffected by underwater visibility (Gledhill et al. 1996) nor are the fish influenced by the presence of a diver. To date there has been limited use of hydroacoustics to monitor spawning aggregations (e.g. Johnston et al. 2006; Taylor et al. 2006; Ehrhardt and Deleveaux 2007) and Taylor et al. (2006) noted the technology can provide an accurate estimate of overall fish abundance and spatial extent in comparison with diver visual counts. Studies comparing hydroacoustics and UVC are sparse, however. Taylor et al. (2006) reported similar acoustic density and diver estimates over their entire survey region, although total abundances differed likely due to differences in area covered by the two methods and the patchy distribution of the fish. Although hydroacoustic techniques hold great promise, many authors highlight that ground-truthing is required to identify the fish to species level (Simmonds and MacLennan 2005; Ryan et al. 2009).

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) lists the Nassau grouper as endangered and recommends annual monitoring at as many traditional aggregation sites as possible, including adjacent areas where aggregations have not previously been reported and as part of the assessment of the effectiveness of protected areas (Carpenter et al. 2015). Given the need to develop effective monitoring techniques that can rapidly, effectively, and quantitatively assess FSA status, we investigated the capacity of hydroacoustics to address these recommendations. We examined FSA locations in relation to protected zones in the Cayman Islands and compared acoustic data with diver-collected data. Further, we evaluated the different acoustic processing methods available to estimate the sizes of fish within FSAs.

Materials and methods

Survey sites

The sites chosen in this study are all within the Designated Grouper Spawning Areas (DGSA) of the Cayman Islands. Surveys were focussed on the likely areas of the FSA, based on site geomorphology and from local knowledge via the Department of Environment (DoE) (Fig. 1). Most survey effort was concentrated on the FSA located at the




Fig. 1 Areas in the Cayman Islands surveyed by hydroacoustics and in-water assessment techniques. The numbers at each site represent the total number of hydroacoustic surveys undertaken at each location. Red dots show located fish spawning aggregations (FSAs); peach colour shows survey tracks that did not locate FSAs. Map data ©2016 Google

Table 1 Dates and times of the surveys conducted, with the number of days elapsed since the February full moon

Survey name	Date	Start time	Stop time	Days after full moon
GCE1	14/02/2014	12:40:43	15:19:39	0
LCE1	15/02/2014	17:48:01	19:33:54	1
LCW1	16/02/2014	12:04:38	12:52:39	2
LCW2	16/02/2014	17:38:42	17:51:19	2
LCW3	16/02/2014	18:38:18	19:12:52	2
LCW4	17/02/2014	13:24:40	13:55:05	3
CBW	17/02/2014	17:05:56	18:25:45	3
CBE	18/02/2014	17:44:52	19:00:25	4
CBW2	18/02/2014	10:43:05	13:04:03	4
CBE2	19/02/2014	07:43:09	08:48:04	5
GCE2	19/02/2014	17:13:11	18:28:32	5
GCE3	20/02/2014	08:13:58	09:41:08	6

Times are in Easter Standard Time (EST) (UTC/GMT -5 h)

west end of Little Cayman (LCW) as this is known to be the most active of the FSAs, and for which concurrent fish abundance and size data obtained via SCUBA were provided by the Grouper Moon project (<http://www.reef.org/groupermoonproject>). Surveys were also conducted at Little Cayman East (LCE), Grand Cayman East (GCE) and Cayman Brac West (CBW) and East (CBE). The field surveys in Cayman occurred between 14 and 20 February 2014 (Table 1).

Equipment

A Biosonics DTX split-beam echosounder with a 200-kHz transducer (beam opening angle of 6.8°), pole mounted over the side of the survey vessel, was used for the surveys. Data were collected with Biosonics visual acquisition software (Biosonics Inc., Seattle, WA). Pulse duration was 0.4 ms, and the specified ping rate was 10 s⁻¹. Survey speed was kept to approximately 4 kn and sea state was

168

169
170
171
172
173
174
175

calm (Beaufort scale 3 or under) on all surveys. The echosounder was calibrated before the start of the surveys on 13 February 2014 using a tungsten carbide 36-mm standard calibration sphere, following the standard methods (Foote et al. 1987; Demer et al. 2015). The acoustic return from the sphere was within acceptable tolerance to the expected value given for the local environmental settings (TS = −39.6 vs. −39.8 dB, respectively (Biosonics 2004), with speed of sound calculated as 1521.54 m s^{−1}). Where diver observations were not available for species ground-truthing, underwater video was used (Thomas and Thorne 2003; Doray et al. 2007; Jones et al. 2012). This consisted of a Sony 37CSHR camera with a live surface feed mounted on an aluminium wing. Both the acoustic data and the video data were time-stamped allowing syncing of the visual and acoustic records in post-processing.

Data processing

Potential Nassau grouper FSAs were initially identified through their stronger backscattering properties and school morphology (Fig. 2) than aggregations of other species (e.g. horse-eye jack, *Caranx latus*) and then verified by visual observation either by the use of the pelagic tow camera or through confirmation by the dive team at LCW.

Data were processed with the software package Sonar5-Pro (Balk and Lindem 2006), following the software-guided analysis routine (see Parker-Stetter et al. 2009 for details). The analysis was based upon echo integration (also known as Sv/TS scaling) which divides the average reflection from all fish over a segment (the volume backscattering coefficient, Sv) by the average target strength (TS) from individual fish (Winfield et al. 2011). TS is defined as $TS = m\text{Log}L + b$ where m and b are constants for a given species and frequency, respectively, and L = length as total length (TL), (Simmonds and MacLennan 2005). Initially, a threshold of −60 dB was applied to the echograms to distinguish fishes from other particulate targets such as plankton. This is a typical threshold applied for the detection of pelagic schooling fishes (Reid 2000). Any noise due to issues such as bubbles in the water column from wave action was removed by eye. Sonar5 applies a time-varied gain correction of $40\text{log}(R)$ for TS values and $20\text{log}(R)$ for Sv values (Balk and Lindem 2006). A bottom exclusion layer of 1 m was applied, and data from within this layer were not included in the analysis due to the ‘acoustic dead zone’ (Ona and Mitson 1996). For echo integration methodology, there are two main options to obtain TS: using tracked fish as a source or using ‘single echoes detected’ (SED) as source. We used tracked fish as source to derive abundance estimates but examined the efficacy of both options to derive

TS. We used the following criteria to track fish within the FSAs: a minimum track length of three pings; a maximum ping gap of two pings; a gating range of 0.3 m; a maximum mean echo threshold of −25 dB; and a minimum mean echo threshold of −40 dB. Due to difficulties in obtaining sufficient numbers of tracks from within FSAs (likely due to high fish density and low signal-to-noise ratios in dense areas of the aggregation), tracks were extracted and stored from all passes of the FSAs per survey and then the tracked fish were used to provide the survey-specific abundance estimates. As tilt angle of fish can have a significant bearing on TS, extreme tilt angles were filtered out of the data following Gauthier and Horne (2004), so that any fish with an aspect $\pm 40^\circ$ from horizontal (dorsal aspect) were removed from the analysis. We examined both the mean TS of fish echoes in each track (calculated in the linear domain) and the 75th percentile of TSs of each track. For fish TS estimates using SED as source, SED were extracted for each pass of an FSA and mean TS values subsequently determined for the FSA from each survey. To assess whether fish near the top of a school were shadowing those beneath them, data were checked to ensure that echo energy was consistent from the top to the bottom of the school following Knudsen et al. (2009) (see electronic supplementary information, ESM, Fig. S1).

Three main equations were examined to convert TS to fish TL by applying our mean TSs values (Table 2). Further, we scaled diver fish length (TL) measurements (taken using a laser calliper system; Heppell et al. 2012) by our mean TS data from tracked fish for the LCW FSA, by sorting both datasets by increasing value and then plotting one against the other to determine a survey-specific TS–TL formula (see ESM Fig. S2) resulting in Formula 4 in Table 2.

TL—weight regressions specific to the Nassau grouper—were used to calculate weight at TL for biomass estimates using the formula $W = aLb$ where W = weight (g), L = TL (cm), $a = 0.01122$, $b = 3.05$ (Froese and Pauly 2016).

Applying the TS–TL formula and then using the specific TL-to-weight relationship for the Nassau grouper (Froese and Pauly 2016) give the mean weight of fish in each FSA. This number was then multiplied by the number of fish estimated in each FSA to provide total biomass estimates for each FSA surveyed.

Spatial extents

Once the FSA was located using preliminary acoustic transects, the aggregation was surveyed from different angles to corroborate its extent. This approach follows Doonan et al. (2003), who noted the advantages of a star-shaped survey track in hydroacoustic surveys over




Fig. 2 An example echogram of the analysis of fish echoes resulting from a Nassau grouper fish spawning aggregation (FSA) (red) and those from an aggregation of horse-eye jacks (blue). The inset shows that grouper had a higher percentage of stronger echoes. Transect distance is shown along the x-axis, while depth [R(m)] and strength of

signal return (colour strip) are shown on the y-axis. The satellite image shows the location of the transect of the Little Cayman west (LCW) 1 survey, and the arrow shows the direction of travel. Map data ©2016 Google

Table 2 Target strength (TS) to length (L) formulae examined in this study

	Formula TS to L	Formula L to TS	Reference	Species	Frequency (kHz)
1	$TS = 19.1 \log_{10}(L) - 64.07$	$L = (2261.8) \cdot \text{EXP}[0.1206 \cdot (TS)]$	Love (1971)	Multi species	200
2	$TS = 0.7091 \cdot L - 89.136$	$L = (TS/0.7091) + 89.136$	Ehrhardt and Deleveaux (2007)	<i>Epinephelus striatus</i>	200
3a	$TS = 19.2 \log_{10}(L) - 64.05$	$L = (2165) \cdot \text{EXP}[0.12 \cdot (TS)]$	Rivera et al. (2010)	<i>Epinephelus guttatus</i>	120
3b ^a	$TS = 19.2 \log_{10}(L) - 64.25$	$L = (2220) \cdot \text{EXP}[0.1199 \cdot (TS)]$	Rivera et al. (2010)	<i>Epinephelus guttatus</i>	200
4	$TS = 27.6 \log_{10}(L) - 147.32$	$L = (207.06) \cdot \text{EXP}[0.0362 \cdot (TS)]$	This study	<i>Epinephelus striatus</i>	200

Length is total length in cm

^a 3b is 3a reformulated for 200 kHz

schooling fishes. Alongside fish abundance values, the geographical extents were also extracted, but these are given in only two dimensions (height and length). Where survey tracks crossed the FSA from different angles, the full three-dimensional extent of the FSA was estimated by drawing a polygon (Fig. 3) as per the arithmetic extrapolation method used by Taylor et al. (2006) and Ehrhardt and

Deleveaux (2007). When the track crossed the FSA from only one angle, it was assumed that the aggregation was circular unless nearby pings showed no fish were present, in which case the halfway point between the positive (FSA detected) and negative (FSA not detected) pings was taken to demarcate the FSA extent. If the FSA represented two or more clear densities, separate polygons were drawn for each

density class present. Once a polygon was drawn, fish abundance was calculated by multiplying the mean number of fish ha^{-1} by the area of the polygon. When there were multiple polygons of differing abundances, the result of each was summed to give a total number of fish.

Statistical analyses

Welch's ANOVAs (equal variances were not assumed) were used to compare fish densities (number of fish 1000 m^{-3} , log transformed) among sites and surveys at LCW, and a two-sample t test was used to compare densities at GCE surveys. Diver fish abundance estimates were compared to the acoustic abundance estimates by using a two-sample t test. The TS values from the different acoustic processing methods were compared for each site with two-sample t tests. Values of fish TL gained from applying tracked fish mean TS data coupled with our in situ formula were compared among the different surveys and sites with Welch's ANOVA, and Games–Howell pairwise comparisons were used to test where the differences among sites existed.

Results

Numbers of fish in each FSA

FSAs were identified at LCW (all four surveys), GCE (two of three surveys) and CBE (one of two surveys). No FSAs

were detected in the surveys of CBW or LCE. Visual confirmation that the targets were Nassau grouper was provided by the Grouper Moon dive team at LCW and at GCE by the towed camera system. We did not achieve visual confirmation of species present at CBE; however, mean TS's and FSA morphology at that location were similar to those at the verified Nassau grouper FSA sites. The highest acoustically measured fish abundance was detected at LCW with a maximum abundance of 2194 fish in the aggregation (survey LCW1) 2 d after the full moon on 16 February 2014. Fish density was significantly greater at LCW FSA than at the other two sites ($F_2 = 25.49$, $p = 0.000$) which did not differ significantly from each other. Fish densities did not differ significantly among individual surveys at the LCW FSA ($F_3 = 1.35$, $p = 0.319$) or the GCE FSA ($T_8 = 1$, $p = 0.349$) (Table 3).

Comparison between acoustic and diver abundance data

Diver-estimated numbers of fish at the LCW FSA were made concurrent with acoustic surveys LCW2, LCW3 and LCW4 (Table 3). Diver confirmation of species also occurred during LCW1, although numbers could not be recorded. No significant difference was detected at the 95% confidence level between diver estimates and acoustics ($T_3 = 0.55$, $p = 0.619$).




Fig. 3 Example of fish spawning aggregation (FSA) polygon determination in the arithmetic extrapolation method during the Little Cayman west (LCW) 4 survey. NG Nassau grouper. Department of

Environment Little Cayman FSA location marker buoys shown in pink and the 200 ft bathymetry contour shown in brown. Crosses indicate where latitude and longitude intersect

341 **Fish TS**

342 Mean fish TS gained through tracked fish was compared
343 with mean fish TS via SED for each site (Fig. 4). There
344 was no significant difference in mean TS values at any site
345 (CBE: $T_{12} = 0.03$, $p = 0.98$, LCW: $T_{47} = 1.44$, $p =$
346 0.157 , GCE: $T_{28} = 0.59$, $p = 0.557$). The TS values from
347 the 75th percentile of echoes in a fish track were signifi-
348 cantly higher than the mean TS at LCW ($T_{192} = 3.78$,
349 $p = 0.000$) and GCE ($T_{429} = 6.91$, $p = 0.000$), but not at
350 CBE ($T_{19} = 1.13$, $p = 0.273$) presumably due to the
351 smaller number of observations reducing statistical power.

352 **Converting TS to TL**

353 Mean TS measurements from tracked fish were scaled by
354 the diver LCW FSA diver length data. This resulted in:
355 $TS = 27.6\log_{10}(L) - 147.32$ ($R^2 = 0.98$; ESM Fig. S2).
356 The results from applying this formula to TS data are
357 plotted for the LCW dataset alongside the alternative
358 equations given in Table 2 (Fig. 5).

359 The results of applying our in situ formula to the
360 acoustic TS data are plotted per individual survey (Fig. 6a)
361 and as mean values per site (Fig. 6b).

362 There was a significant difference in mean fish TL
363 calculated from mean TS of tracked fish between the sites
364 ($F_2 = 15.08$, $p = 0.000$), with significantly larger fish at
365 LCW than at GCE but not CBE, which did not differ from
366 each other. Using the von Bertalanffy growth curve for the
367 Nassau grouper sampled from aggregations in the Cayman
368 Islands 1987–1992 (Bush et al. 2006), the estimated mean
369 fish TL of 65.4 ± 0.7 cm seen at the LCW FSA corre-
370 sponds to an age of 10 yr. The estimated mean sizes of fish




Fig. 4 Mean fish target strength (TS) found in fish spawning aggregations during each survey, per site and for each of the acoustic processing methods. *CBE* Grand Cayman Brac, *GCE* Grand Cayman east, *LCW* Little Cayman west, *Tr M* mean echo of tracked fish, *Q3 Tr* 75th percentile of echoes from tracked fish, *SED* single echoes detected. Box plots show mean values (black circle), median values (solid horizontal line), and the lower and upper ends of the box are the 25 and 75% quartiles, respectively. The whiskers indicate 1.5 times the inter-quartile range, and points beyond this range are shown by empty circles

at the GCE FSA (60.7 ± 0.4 cm) and CBE
(61.1 ± 2.5 cm) correspond to those of 8-year-old fish.

**FSA location relative to Cayman Islands DoE
Designated Grouper Spawning Areas**

The extent of the FSA located on Grand Cayman fell on the
extreme northern limit of the DGSA boundary on the

Table 3 Estimates of mean TS, mean lengths, weights, fish numbers and subsequent biomass values per survey where a FSA was identified as derived from mean TS from tracked fish

Survey name	Mean TS (dB)	Mean length (cm)	Mean weight (g)	Fish number	Biomass (kg)	Verification method	Fish density (#/1000 m ³)	Fish number/isonified volume (Nv)	Mean depth (m)
LCW1	−31.98 (0.86)	65.22 (2.06)	3900.03 (390.9)	2194	8556.67	D (NP)	46.89 (24.60)	0.095 (0.05)	28.0 (1.4)
LCW2	−32.89 (1.43)	63.60 (3.30)	3782.35 (598.3)	398	1505.37	D (1225)	24.69 (12.76)	0.051 (0.024)	28.9 (2.1)
LCW3	−32.62 (1.25)	63.94 (2.97)	3746.54 (559.0)	122	457.08	D (1225)	18.20 (5.29)	0.031 (0.007)	26.2 (2.6)
LCW4	−30.50 (0.84)	68.86 (2.11)	4615.64 (443.8)	857	3955.60	D (1000)	32.87 (21.50)	0.072 (0.046)	29.0 (2.6)
LCW all	−32.01 (0.61)	65.40 (1.44)	4018.20 (268.1)	893	3588.25	D	33.13 (11.02)	0.067 (0.023)	28.1 (1.1)
CBE1	−33.95 (2.26)	61.12 (5.08)	3327.10 (849.2)	58	192.97	NP	4.61 (2.27)	0.009 (0.005)	30.4 (1.9)
GCE2	−33.95 (0.55)	60.90 (1.2)	3208.22 (191.6)	49	157.20	TC	4.01 (2.24)	0.0198 (0.011)	43.7 (2.2)
GCE3	−34.07 (0.48)	60.61 (1.08)	3162.43 (181.7)	40	126.50	TC	8.37 (5.82)	0.042 (0.028)	46.1 (1.1)
GCE all	−34.01 (0.36)	60.74 (0.8)	3183.32 (131.6)	45	143.25	TC	7.01 (4.12)	0.035 (0.019)	45.2 (1.1)

Fish density is number of fish per 1000 m³. Nv is number of fish per volume isonified (Sawada et al. 1993). Verification method shows how the fish were identified *D* diver (number in brackets), *NP* not possible, *TC* towed camera. Mean depth is the mean fish depth at each FSA. Numbers in brackets are 95% confidence levels

GCE2 survey and just outside the boundary during the GCE3 survey. At CBE, the FSA was just within the boundary close to its northern limit. The LCW FSA was within the associated protection zone (Fig. 7).

Discussion

The greatest fish abundances and densities were recorded at the LCW FSA. This is as expected as this particular FSA is well known throughout the Caribbean for the high numbers of fish present there during spawning periods (Whaylen et al. 2004). It should be noted that these surveys occurred closest to the full moon (2–3 d after the full moon), when Nassau grouper FSAs are most active (Starr et al. 2007). The surveys LCW1 and LCW4 both yielded very similar patterns of fish distribution and had the highest abundance estimates. These surveys occurred at similar times near the middle of the day, while surveys LCW2 and LCW3, both occurring near dusk, recorded lower abundances. Other studies have found that groupers were more densely aggregated at sunrise and sunset (Whaylen et al. 2006), and it is possible that the main aggregation may therefore have been missed by surveys LCW2 and LCW3, or that abundance estimates are more robust when fish are more dispersed as has been seen in other studies (Rudstam et al. 2003).

At any given time in the LCW FSA, some proportion of the fish are located on the plateau and across a wider area than is represented by the main aggregation at the reef crest (Whaylen et al. 2006); it is possible that the acoustics may not have detected these individuals. In addition, as fish




Fig. 5 Target Strength (TS) data from the Little Cayman west (LCW) surveys and corresponding fish total length using the following empirical formulas: $TS = 19.2\log_{10}(L) - 64.05$ (blue; Rivera et al. 2010); $TS = 19.1\log_{10}(L) - 64.07$ (pink, partially hidden due to similar values as green; Love 1971); $TS = 0.7091 * L - 89.136$ (yellow; Erhardt and Deleveau 2007), $TS = 27.6\log_{10}(L) - 147.32$ (red, this study)





Fig. 6 Mean fish total length (TL) as calculated by applying our in situ formula **a** during each survey and **b** as grouped data per site. Box plots show median values (solid horizontal line), and the lower and upper ends of the box are the 25 and 75% quartiles, respectively. The whiskers indicate 1.5 times the inter-quartile range and points beyond this range are shown by empty circles

within 1 m of the seabed were not included in the study, acoustic abundance estimates are best considered an index of abundance rather than an absolute abundance and are likely to be conservative compared to the total number of all spawning fish. The LCW FSA was most active the day before the acoustic surveys (15 February, 1 d after the full moon) with 4000 fish estimated by the dive team. Our peak number of fish was detected the following day. The CBE FSA was surveyed 4 d after the full moon, and the FSA at GCE surveyed 5 and 6 d after the full moon; only small numbers of fish were found at either location. It is likely that the acoustics results underestimate the total abundances of individuals in these FSAs as they do not account for the most active times, i.e. closer to the full moon. Therefore, we recommend that to fully evaluate a given FSA, acoustic surveys should be conducted both over several days and at multiple times per day to increase the probability of capturing peak abundance at any given FSA. Note that we assumed that all echoes from within a FSA were Nassau grouper, but it is possible that relatively low numbers of other fish species were also present.

We evaluated the possibility of acoustic shadowing leading to the differences between diver estimates and acoustic estimates of fish numbers. No decrease in echo energy from the top of the FSAs to the bottom was found, indicating that the acoustic technique can be used to accurately quantify fish in FSAs (Knudsen et al. 2009). However, this is contrary to some other studies which have reported a shadowing effect in dense schools of marine fishes (Zhao and Ona 2003; Utne and Ona 2006; Løland et al. 2007).

Fig. 7 Fish spawning aggregation locations and maximum extents detected via hydroacoustics in the Cayman Islands in relation to the positions of the Designated Grouper Spawning Areas (hatched area)



43 **AQ3** We examined three different methods in the acoustic
 438 post-processing to extract TS values, and it is interesting to
 439 note that mean TS with SED as source did not differ sig-
 440 nificantly from the mean TS of tracked fish. When fish are
 441 tilted further from the horizontal, TS is reduced so max TS
 442 may be a better estimator than mean TS (Balk and Lindem
 443 2006). However, to remove any effect of ‘flash echoes’
 444 (Lilja et al. 2004) and also the potential exaggerating
 445 effects on mean TS of multiple echoes (Soule et al. 1995;
 446 Rudstam et al. 2003), a 75th percentile of the TS along a
 447 tracked fish was also examined and unsurprisingly yielded
 448 higher values overall than the other two methods. How-
 449 ever, we used the mean TS for subsequent calculations as
 450 this method is most common in the literature (e.g. Guillard
 451 et al. 2004; Rose 2009).

452 TS varies with tilt angle (Nielsen and Lundgren 1999),
 453 and among fish species due to anatomical differences in the
 454 size of the swim bladder (Simmonds and MacLennan
 455 2005). Therefore, an empirical TS–TL relationship is
 456 needed to convert TS to fish TL, which is known for many
 457 species (Kracker 2007). Ideally, TS data should be
 458 obtained from fish that are typical of the population to be
 459 surveyed (Simmonds and MacLennan 2005). The LCW

FSA presented a rare opportunity to do this as the fish
 species (almost entirely Nassau grouper) could be deter-
 mined by divers who were also able to provide accurate
 length measurements. By scaling our TS values by the
 diver measurements, we derived an alternative in situ TS–
 TL equation allowing comparison to the other equations
 examined. Application of either the Love (1971) or Rivera
 et al. (2010) formula results in a significant underestima-
 tion of fish size in comparison with the diver data.
 Although our equation contains a log function, it is more
 similar to the Erhardt and Deleveau (Erhardt and Dele-
 veaux 2007) than the other equations. This is likely to be
 due to the relatively narrow range of fish sizes in both their
 and our studies, as these are the lengths of reproductively
 active fish. While applying our equation matches diver
 lengths at LCW, we are hesitant to suggest without further
 evaluation that it should be used in preference to other
 equations in future studies due to a number of reasons.
 First, there was a relatively narrow range of fish lengths
 present in the FSA as seen by divers, and applying our
 formula may have the effect of overestimating the size of
 smaller fish and underestimating the size of larger fish
 beyond the range experienced here. Second, there are

460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482

difficulties in extracting tracked fish TS data from the centre of FSAs and it may be the case that the tracked fish, more commonly located on the periphery of the aggregation, may be of a different size or orientation than those in the centre (Starr et al. 1995). Third, tracking fish is difficult in vertical marine applications (Guillard et al. 2004), and although we experienced calm sea states, vessel movement is likely to have reduced the number of possible tracks and increased variation in TS. We recommend further examination of the TS–TL relationship for Nassau grouper and that caged fish experiments, or similar, should be conducted across a larger range of fish sizes to obtain more empirical data points from which a potentially more robust equation can be determined. Future research examining the novel combination of hydroacoustics and laser callipers could prove useful for FSA monitoring and other assessments of fish populations. The effect of reproductive state on TS of Nassau grouper would also be worthy of examination, since the relationship of gonad size to swim bladder volume of spawning sardines is as important as the relationship of the swim bladder volume to fish length (Machias and Tsimenidis 1995). Mean fish TL was significantly larger at LCW than at GCE, but not CBE. As younger fish tend to be smaller, a recovering population may have a larger proportion of smaller fish (Heppell et al. 2012). Our results could indicate that the FSAs on GCE and CBE may be recovering from previous exploitation (Bush et al. 2006) or that the generally smaller fish at those locations are a result of larger fish being removed by fishing.

Hydroacoustics allowed us to determine the location of FSAs in three-dimensional space. Spawning aggregations were consistently found just off the reef crest at around 30 m depth at LCW as has been described previously by direct observation (Whaylen et al. 2004). The depths of FSAs will be influenced by a number of factors such as diurnal time of survey or lunar phase (Starr et al. 2007); however, knowing the depths from our surveys may assist managers in determining optimum future survey strategies. The relatively deep FSA of GCE was also noted by Kobara and Heyman (2008) and is most likely due to the spawning suitability of the local geomorphologic characteristics at the site. The depth at which this FSA occurs highlights the difficulty of visual census approaches using SCUBA. FSAs can move between repeat surveys within the same lunar period, and some wider movement not detected in this study could reasonably be expected. We recommend including line fishing in the one-mile-radius restrictive buffers around DGSAs or increasing the size of the DGSAs as a further precautionary measure. If fishing occurs at the edge of the protected areas, as is common practice following closures to fishing (Kellner et al. 2007), it is

possible that these FSAs, which may be recovering, could still be at risk.

Hydroacoustics has proven capable of locating FSAs in historic areas where it was unknown whether fish were still aggregating. This also means that acoustics can be used to search for aggregations in new locations and used in situations when diving surveys are impractical or hazardous. We have shown that surveying FSAs with hydroacoustics produces fish count information comparable to that from diver estimates, and it provides additional information such as fish size when ground-truthing is also provided, although further work is needed in this area. Repeating hydroacoustics surveys could yield much information on how exploited FSAs are recovering and could assist with the vital monitoring of endangered aggregating populations.

Acknowledgements Thanks to all the staff of the Cayman Islands DoE for their assistance and making me so welcome and in particular, Bradley Johnson and Phillipe Bush, whose local knowledge resulted in the success of this research and also Laura Richardson and Jeremy Olynik for much general help. Thanks to the Reef Environmental Education Foundation and researchers associated with the Grouper Moon project for providing diver census data. Further, we thank Dr Helge Balk for advice on the data processing in Sonar5 and the comments of two anonymous reviewers whose input greatly increased the strength of the manuscript. The funding for the surveys was provided by The Darwin Initiative (UK Government) EIDPO045 (Assessing engagement in Cayman's enhanced marine protected area system).

References

- Archer SK, Heppell SA, Semmens BX, Pattengill-Semmens CV, Bush PG, McCoy CM, Johnson BC (2012) Patterns of color phase indicate spawn timing at a Nassau grouper *Epinephelus striatus* spawning aggregation. *Curr Zool* 58:73–83
- Balk H, Lindem T (2006) Sonar 4, Sonar 5, Sonar 6 e post-processing systems. Operator manual. Lindem Data Acquisition, Oslo
- Biosonics (2004) Calibration of Biosonics Digital Scientific Echo-sounder using T/C calibration spheres. www.biosonicsinc.com/doc_library/docs/DTXcalibration2e.pdf
- Bush PG, Lane ED, Ebanks-Petrie GC, Luke K, Johnson B, McCoy C, Bothwell J, Parsons E (2006) The Nassau grouper spawning aggregation fishery of the Cayman Islands—an historical and management perspective. *Proceedings of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute* 57:515–524
- Carpenter KE, Claro R, Cowan J, Sedberry G, Zapp-Sluis M (2015) *Epinephelus striatus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015: e.T7862A70324790
- Cayman Islands Government (2016) The National Conservation (General) Regulations Part 2.6. <http://www.gov.ky/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/12326595.PDF>
- Colin PL (1992) Reproduction of the Nassau grouper, *Epinephelus striatus* (Pisces: Serranidae) and its relationship to environmental conditions. *Environ Biol Fish* 34:357–377
- Demer DA, Berger L, Bernasconi M, Bethke E, Boswell K, Chu D, Domokos R et al (2015) Calibration of acoustic instruments. Cooperative Research Report 326, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, 133 pp

- 591 Domeier ML, Colin P (1997) Tropical reef fish spawning aggrega- 657
 592 tions defined and reviewed. *Bull Mar Sci* 60:698–726 658
 593 Doonan I, Bull B, Coombs R (2003) Star acoustic surveys of localized 659
 594 fish aggregations. *ICES J Mar Sci* 60:132–146 660
 595 Doray M, Josse E, Gervain P, Reynal L, Chantrel J (2007) Joint use of 661
 596 echosounding, fishing and video techniques to assess the 662
 597 structure of fish aggregations around moored fish aggregating 663
 598 devices in Martinique (Lesser Antilles). *Aquat Living Resour* 664
 599 20:357–366 665
 600 Ehrhardt NM, Deleveau VKW (2007) The Bahamas' Nassau 666
 601 grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) fishery—two assessment methods 667
 602 applied to a data-deficient coastal population. *Fish Res* 87:17–27 668
 603 Foote KG, Knudsen HP, Vestnes G, MacLennan DN, Simmonds EJ 669
 604 (1987) Calibration of acoustic instruments for fish-density 670
 605 estimation: a practical guide. Cooperative Research Report 671
 606 144, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, 57 pp 672
 607 Froese R, Pauly D (2016) FishBase. World Wide Web electronic 673
 608 publication. www.fishbase.org, version (10/2016) 674
 609 Gascoigne J (2002) Nassau grouper and queen conch in the Bahamas: 675
 610 status and management options. Report to the Bahamas Reef 676
 611 Environment Educational Foundation. Nassau, The Bahamas 677
 612 Gauthier S, Horne JK (2004) Potential acoustic discrimination within 678
 613 boreal fish assemblages. *ICES J Mar Sci* 61:836–845 679
 614 Gibson J (2007) Managing a Nassau grouper fishery—a case study 680
 615 from Belize. *Proceedings of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries* 681
 616 *Institute* 60:1–2 682
 617 Gledhill CT, Lyczkowski-Shultz J, Rademacher K, Kargard E, Crist 683
 618 G, Grace MA (1996) Evaluation of video and acoustic index 684
 619 methods for assessing reef-fish populations. *ICES J Mar Sci* 685
 620 53:483–485 686
 621 Guillard J, Lebourges-Dhaussy A, Brehmer P (2004) Simultaneous Sv 687
 622 and TS measurements on young-of-the-year (YOY) freshwater 688
 623 fish using three frequencies. *ICES J Mar Sci* 61:267–273 689
 624 Heppell SA, Semmens BX, Archer SK, Pattengill-Semmens CV, 690
 625 Bush PG, McCoy CM, Heppell SS, Johnson BC (2012) 691
 626 Documenting recovery of a spawning aggregation through size 692
 627 frequency analysis from underwater laser calipers measure- 693
 628 ments. *Biol Conserv* 155:119–127 694
 629 Johannes RE (1978) Reproductive strategies of coastal marine fishes 695
 630 in the tropics. *Environ Biol Fish* 3:65–84 696
 631 Johannes RE, Squire L, Granam T, Sadovy Y, Rengul H (1999) 697
 632 Spawning aggregations of groupers (Serranidae) in Palau. 698
 633 Marine Conservation Research Series Publication 1, The Nature 699
 634 Conservancy, 144 pp 700
 635 Johnston SV, Rivera JA, Rosario A, Timko MA, Nealson PA, 701
 636 Kumagai KK (2006) Hydroacoustic evaluation of spawning red 702
 637 hind (*Epinephelus guttatus*) aggregations along the coast of 703
 638 Puerto Rico in 2002 and 2003. *Emerging technologies for reef* 704
 639 *fisheries research and management*, National Marine Fisheries 705
 640 Service Professional Paper 5. NOAA, Seattle, WA, pp 10–17 706
 641 Jones DT, Wilson CD, Robertis AD, Rooper CN, Weber TC, Butler 707
 642 JL (2012) Evaluation of rockfish abundance in untrawlable 708
 643 habitat: combining acoustic and complementary sampling tools. 709
 644 *Fish Bulletin* 110:332–343 710
 645 Kadison E, Nemeth RS, Blondeau J, Smith T, Calnan J (2010) Nassau 711
 646 grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) in St. Thomas, US Virgin Islands, 712
 647 with evidence for a spawning aggregation site recovery. 713
 648 *Proceedings of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute* 714
 649 62:273–279 715
 650 Kellner JB, Tetreault I, Gaines SD, Nisbet RM (2007) Fishing the line 716
 651 near marine reserves in single and multispecies fisheries. *Ecol* 717
 652 *Appl* 17:1039–1054 718
 653 Knudsen FR, Hawkins AD, McAllen R, Sand O (2009) Diel 719
 654 interactions between sprat and mackerel in a marine lough and 720
 655 their effects upon acoustic measurements of fish abundance. *Fish* 721
 656 *Res* 100:140–147 722
- Kobara S, Heyman WD (2008) Geomorphometric patterns of Nassau 657
 grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) spawning aggregation sites in the 658
 Cayman Islands. *Marine Geodesy* 31:231–245 659
 Kracker L (2007) Hydroacoustic surveys: a non-destructive approach 660
 to monitoring fish distributions at National Marine Sanctuaries. 661
 Technical Memorandum 66, National Ocean Service, National 662
 Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, NOAA, Charleston, SC 663
 Lilja J, Marjomäki TJ, Jurvelius J, Rossi T, Heikkola E (2004) 664
 Simulation and experimental measurement of side-aspect target 665
 strength of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) at high frequency. *Can* 666
J Fish Aquat Sci 61:2227–2236 667
 Løland A, Aldrin M, Ona E, Hjellvik V, Holst JC (2007) Estimating 668
 and decomposing total uncertainty for survey based abundance 669
 estimates of Norwegian spring spawning herring. *ICES J Mar Sci* 670
 64:1302–1312 671
 Love RH (1971) Measurements of fish target strength: a review. 672
Fishery Bulletin 69:703–715 673
 Machias A, Tsimenidis N (1995) Biological factors affecting the 674
 swimbladder volume of sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*). *Mar Biol* 675
 23:859–867 676
 Murphy HM, Jenkins GP (2010) Observational methods used in 677
 marine spatial monitoring of fishes and associated habitats: a 678
 review. *Mar Freshw Res* 61:236–252 679
 Nemeth RS (2005) Population characteristics of a recovering US 680
 Virgin Islands red hind spawning aggregation following protec- 681
 tion. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 286:81–97 682
 Nielsen JR, Lundgren B (1999) Hydroacoustic ex situ target strength 683
 measurements on juvenile cod (*Gadus morhua* L.). *ICES J Mar* 684
Sci 56:627–639 685
 Ona E, Mitson RB (1996) Acoustic sampling and signal processing 686
 near the seabed: the deadzone revisited. *ICES J Mar Sci* 687
 53:677–690 688
 Parker-Stetter SL, Rudstam LG, Sullivan PJ, Warner DM (2009) 689
 Standard operating procedures for fisheries acoustic surveys in 690
 the Great Lakes. Special Publication 09-01, Great Lakes 691
 Fisheries Commission, Ann Arbor, MI 692
 Reid DG (2000) Report on echo trace classification. Cooperative 693
 Research Report No. 238, International Council for the Explora- 694
 tion of the Sea, Copenhagen, Denmark, 107 pp 695
 Rivera J, Kellison T, Appeldoorn RS, Schärer M, Nemeth M, Rowell 696
 T, Mateos D, Nealson P (2010) Detection of Mona Island and 697
 Abirir La Sierra, Puerto Rico red hind (*Epinephelus guttatus*) 1 m 698
 off the bottom with hydroacoustic techniques. *Proceedings of the* 699
Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute 63:143–148 700
 Rose GA (2009) Variations in the target strength of Atlantic cod 701
 during vertical migration. *ICES J Mar Sci* 66:1205–1211 702
 Rudstam LG, Parker SL, Einhouse DW, Witzel LD, Warner DM, 703
 Stritzel JL, Parrish DL, Sullivan PJ (2003) Application of in situ 704
 target-strength estimations in lakes: examples from rainbow- 705
 smelt surveys in Lakes Erie and Champlain. *ICES J Mar Sci* 706
 60:500–507 707
 Ryan TE, Kloser RJ, Macaulay GJ (2009) Measurement and visual 708
 verification of fish target strength using an acoustic-optical 709
 system attached to a trawl. *ICES J Mar Sci* 66:238–1244 710
 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y (2016) Mainstreaming fish spawning 711
 aggregations into fishery management calls for a precautionary 712
 approach. *BioScience* 66:295–306 713
 Sadovy Y, Domeier M (2005) Are aggregation fisheries sustainable? 714
 Reef fish fisheries as a case study. *Coral Reefs* 24:254–262 715
 Sadovy Y, Colin PL (eds) (2012) Reef fish spawning aggregations: 716
 biology, research and management. Springer, Berlin 717
 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Erisman B (2012) Fishery and biological 718
 implications of fishing spawning aggregations, and the social and 719
 economic importance of aggregating fishes. In: Sadovy Y, Colin 720
 PL (eds) Reef fish spawning aggregations: biology, research and 721
 management. Springer, Berlin, pp 225–284 722

- 723 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Cornish A, Domeier M, Colin P, Russell M, 757
 724 Lindeman K (2008) A global baseline for spawning aggregations 758
 725 of reef fishes. *Conserv Biol* 22:1233–1244 759
- 726 Sala E, Ballesteros E, Starr RM (2001) Rapid decline of Nassau 760
 727 grouper spawning aggregations in Belize: fishery management 761
 728 and conservation needs. *Fisheries* 26:23–30 762
- 729 Semmens BX, Bush P, Heppell S, Johnson B, McCoy C, Pattengill- 763
 730 Semmens C, Whaylen L (2007) Charting a course for Nassau 764
 731 grouper recovery in the Caribbean: what we've learned and what 765
 732 we still need to know. *Proceedings of the Gulf and Caribbean* 766
 733 *Fisheries Institute* 60:607–609 767
- 734 Simmonds EJ, MacLennan DN (2005) *Fisheries acoustics: theory and* 768
 735 *practice*, 2nd ed. Fish and Fisheries Series, Blackwell, Oxford, 769
 736 UK 770
- 737 Smith CL (1972) A spawning aggregation of Nassau grouper, 771
 738 *Epinephelus striatus* (Bloch). *Trans Am Fish Soc* 101:257–261 772
- 739 Soule M, Hampton I, Barange M (1995) Evidence of bias in estimates 773
 740 of target strength obtained with a split-beam echo-sounder. *ICES* 774
 741 *J Mar Sci* 52:139–144 775
- 742 Stallings CD (2008) Indirect effects of an exploited predator on 776
 743 recruitment of coral reef fishes. *Ecology* 89:2090–2095 777
- 744 Stallings CD (2009) Predator identity and recruitment of coral-reef 778
 745 fishes: indirect effects of fishing. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 779
 746 383:251–259 780
- 747 Starr RM, Sala E, Ballesteros E, Zabala M (2007) Spatial dynamics of 781
 748 the Nassau grouper *Epinephelus striatus* in a Caribbean atoll. 782
 749 *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 343:239–249 783
- 750 Starr RM, Fox DS, Hixon MA, Tissot BN, Johnson GE, Barss WH 784
 751 (1995) Comparison of submersible-survey and hydroacoustic- 785
 752 survey estimates of fish density on a rocky bank. *Fishery Bulletin* 786
 753 94:113–123 787
- 754 Taylor CJ, Eggleston DB, Rand PS (2006) Nassau grouper 788
 755 (*Epinephelus striatus*) spawning aggregations: hydroacoustic 789
 756 surveys and geostatistical analysis. *Emerging technologies for* 790
 reef fisheries research and management, National Marine 791
 Fisheries Service Professional Paper 5. NOAA, Seattle, WA, 792
 pp 18–25 793
- Thomas GL, Thorne RE (2003) Acoustical-optical assessment of 794
 Pacific herring and their predator assemblage in Prince William 795
 Sound, Alaska. *Aquat Living Resour* 16:247–253 796
- Trenkel VM, Ressler PH, Jech M, Giannoulaki M, Taylor C (2011) 797
 Underwater acoustics for ecosystem-based management: state of 798
 the science and proposals for ecosystem indicators. *Mar Ecol* 799
Prog Ser 442:285–301 800
- Utne KR, Ona E (2006) Acoustic extinction in dense herring layers, 801
 measured from a bottom-mounted transducer. Document CM/ 802
 2006/I: 10, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, 803
 Copenhagen, Denmark 804
- Whaylen L, Pattengill-Semmens CV, Semmens BX, Bush PG, 805
 Boardman MR (2004) Observations of a Nassau grouper 806
 (*Epinephelus striatus*) spawning aggregation site in Little 807
 Cayman, including multi-species spawning information. *Environ* 808
Biol Fish 70:305–313 809
- Whaylen L, Bush PG, Johnson BC, Luke KE, McCoy CMR, Heppell 810
 S, Semmens BX, Boardman M (2006) Aggregation dynamics 811
 and lessons learned from five years of monitoring at a Nassau 812
 grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) spawning aggregation in Little 813
 Cayman, Cayman Islands, BWI. *Proceedings of the Gulf and* 814
Caribbean Fisheries Institute 57:1–14 815
- Winfield IJ, Emmrich M, Guillard J, Mehner T, Rustadbakken A 816
 (2011) Guidelines for standardisation of hydroacoustic methods. 817
 Centre for Ecology and Hydrology Project Number C03630, 818
 European Commission, 30 pp 819
- Zhao X, Ona E (2003) Estimation and compensation models for the 820
 shadowing effect in dense fish aggregations. *ICES J Mar Sci* 821
 60:155–163 822